

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 21, 2009. Through this response, claims 20, 24 and 27 have been amended and claims 28-30 have been added. Added language in the amended claims and in the amended specification is supported by the figures in the original application, especially Figures 1-6. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 20 and 22-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that in claim 20, the preamble claims the device as being a “clothing strap tensioning device” without claiming the elements which cause the tensioning. Also, the Examiner states that it is unclear which straps are under tensioning. Applicant has amended the claims and specification pursuant to the comments of the Examiner in the pending Office Action. The rejection is therefore respectfully traversed.

Additionally, the Examiner states that in claim 22 it is not clear that the “length of the middle portion is approximately equal to the combined lengths of the left and right end portions”. This language is supported by the figures in the original application, especially Figure 6. It is clear that the middle portion, which would be closest to the wearer, is

approximately equal to the combined lengths of the left and right end portions, which would be furthest from the wearer.

Additionally, the Examiner states that claim 27 language is not clear for reasons including those stated with regard to claim 20 concerning “tensioning” of the clothing straps. The claim has also been amended pursuant to the comments of the Examiner.

Also, in accordance with matters discussed in telephonic discussions with the Examiner, new claims 28-30 have been added as method claims incorporating the apparatus of the present invention.

II. Response to Arguments

Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s indication that Applicant’s arguments with respect to claims 20 and 22-27 in regard to Speelman (U.S. Pat. No. 4,384,583) have been considered and overcomes the straight Speelman configuration. Applicant further appreciates the Response to Arguments of the Examiner which indicates that the amendments herein address the structure issues related to Claims 22-27.

In that it is believed that every rejection has been overcome, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims that remains in the case is presently in condition for allowance.

III. New Claims

As identified above, method claims 28-30 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an

invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully request that these claims be held to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of Applicant's remaining pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(f)III.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit overpayments or charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/joseph r. englander/
Joseph R. Englander
Registration No. 38,871
SHUTTS & BOWEN LLP
200 E. Broward Boulevard, Suite 2100
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Telephone: (954) 524-5505
Facsimile: (954) 524-5506
Email: jenglander@shutts.com